

REMARKS

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 28-34, 36-43, 45-52 and 54-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,758,062 issued to McMahon et al. (*McMahon*) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0268306 issued to Cheng et al. (*Cheng*).

Applicant submits claims 28-34, 36-43, 45-52 and 54-57 are not obvious in view of *McMahon* and *Cheng* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 28 recites, in part, converting the output into a geographic-neutral and linguistic-neutral format. Claims 37 and 46 recite similar limitations. The Office action correctly concedes that *McMahon* fails to disclose converting the output into a geographic-neutral and linguistic-neutral format. The Office action proceeds to cite *Cheng* as disclosing the deficient limitations. *Cheng* discusses an invention that provides for displaying data in a selected language using XSL stylesheets. See paragraphs [0012] and [0014]. In particular, *Cheng* discusses generating data values and incorporating them into a language independent markup document. See paragraphs [0079]-[0080]. Those data values have no geographic or linguistic-specific format at the time they are generated. Thus, the incorporation of the data values into a language independent markup document is not a process of conversion, but rather a process of generation. Thus, *Cheng* does not disclose converting an output from a geographic-specific and linguistic-specific format to a geographic-neutral and linguistic-neutral format as recited in claim 28.

Furthermore, Applicant claims a test script that sends known test inputs in the geographic-neutral and linguistic-neutral format to the business layer of a multi-tiered

application. In contrast, the application (software product) of *Cheng* merely facilitates display of data in different languages based on different XSL stylesheets. *Cheng* does not disclose testing applications at a business layer using data that has been converted into a geographic-neutral and linguistic-neutral format. Thus, *Cheng* fails to cure the deficiencies of *McMahon*. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 28, 37 and 46 are not obvious in view of *McMahon* and *Cheng*.

Claims 29-34, 36 and 55-57 depend from claim 28. Claims 38-43 and 45 depend from claim 37. Claims 47-52 and 54 depend from claim 46. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits the dependent claims referenced above are not obvious for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are not obvious.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 28-34, 36-43, 45-52 and 54-57 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: July 18, 2008

*/Jared S. Engstrom/
Jared S. Engstrom
Reg. No. 58,330
Attorney for Applicant*

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: July 18, 2008

*/Katherine Jennings/
Katherine Jennings*